

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed June 16, 2005, the Examiner noted that claims 1-15 were pending and rejected all claims. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7-15 have been amended and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1-15 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

On pages 2 and 3 of the Action the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4 and 7-15 for failure to comply with the written description requirements and as failing to set forth the subject matter regarded as the invention particularly with respect to the claim text "undistributed". The claims have been amended and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

On pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. section 112 paragraph 2 as indefinite. The claims have been amended in consideration of the Examiner's comments and if submitted they satisfy the requirements of the statute. If additional concerns with the claims arise, the Examiner is invited to telephone to resolve the same. Suggestions by the Examiner are also welcome. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

On page 9 the Examiner indicated that claims 2 and 5 would be allowed if the above-discussed rejection for indefiniteness was overcome. Claims 3 and 6 depend from claims 2 and 5 respectively. An indication of allowance for these claims is requested.

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4 and 7-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Nakagaki. Page 6 of the Office Action rejects claims 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Nakagaki and Oku.

Claims 1, 4 and 7-15 now emphasize that the storage is a shared storage that stores and collectively manages the process information or transactions of the different systems and allows access to and tracking of the transactions or process history without requiring access to the different systems.

Nakagaki and Oku do not teach or suggest such.

It is submitted that the invention of the claims distinguishes over the prior art and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112. It is also submitted that claims 2, 3, 5 and 6 continue to be allowable. It is further submitted that the

claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 12/15/15

By: 
J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501